



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ew

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,026	07/16/2003	Thomas Weide	2209.925 (WSC-2192)	1160
21878	7590	08/12/2004	EXAMINER	
KENNEDY COVINGTON LOBDELL & HICKMAN, LLP			HURLEY, SHAUN R	
214 N. TRYON STREET			ART UNIT	
HEARST TOWER, 47TH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
CHARLOTTE, NC 28202			3765	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/621,026

Applicant(s)

WEIDE ET AL.

Examiner

Shaun R Hurley

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/17/03, 04/14/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schuster (3805505) in view of Schlomer et al (6035625).

Schuster teaches a yarn withdrawal nozzle for an open-end rotor spinning arrangement (Figure 1) having an inlet funnel (Figure 2) and a coaxially, concentrically arranged structure comprised of 2-6 circularly-shaped beads or grooves of different diameters in the inlet funnel (70). While Schuster essentially teaches the invention as discussed above, he fails to specifically teach notches arranged in the traveling direction of a yarn downstream of the grooves or beads. Schlomer teaches that placing such notches downstream of beads or grooves is well known, so as to aid in twisting (34). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to utilize the notches as taught by Schlomer in the withdrawal nozzle of Schuster, so as to provide a higher quality yarn. The ordinarily skilled artisan would have understood the situation in which such notches were taught, and would have known to apply such notches to the nozzle of Schuster so as to enable a better twist to form.

Likewise, Schlomer also teaches that beads or grooves may occur in an outlet area of the inlet funnel, providing the same yarn enhancing properties (Figure 2).

Art Unit: 3765

In regards to a polished heavy-duty ceramic material being used for the withdrawal nozzle, such is well known in the art. Polished ceramic provides a smooth, heat resistant surface ideal for yarn contact, and the ordinarily skilled artisan understands its utilization.

In regards to claim 8, this is a product by process claim, and provides no further definition to the independent claim other than the fact that the nozzle is producible.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Havranek et al (3834147), Preininger et al (6389789), Busch et al (4610134), and Raasch (5423177) all teach what is well known in the art.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shaun R Hurley whose telephone number is (703) 605-1236. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 6:30am - 3:00pm, off every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John J Calvert can be reached on (703) 305-1025. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SRH
02 August 2004


JOHN J. CALVERT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700